

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 23, 24, and 26-52 remain pending in the present application. The amendment to claims 23 and 24 clarifies that the film has two outer skin layers and a core layer. No new matter is added.

Claims 23, 29-30, 44-46 and 51-52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ezaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,520,972) in view of Lue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,171). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration, since the references, even in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every claim limitation.

Applicants reiterate their comments in traverse of the rejection as submitted in their response mailed November 2, 2009. In short, the Examiner's proposed combination of references requires a skilled artisan reading Ezaki et al. to laminate the A/B/A structure therein to form a structure A/B/A/A/B/A, such that layers A, which contain HDPE/LDPE could be considered "core" layers.

However, the Examiner's proposal ignores the fact that upon such modification to Ezaki et al., the B layers, which contain LLDPE, would be intermediate layers and not "outer skin" layers, as claimed herein.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment submitted herewith clarifies that the film has two outer skin layers, i.e., surface layers. A full and fair reading of the present application would suggest nothing else to the skilled artisan:

As used herein, the term "skin layer" means that the layer is the outer layer of the structure. Thus, in a three-layer structure there are two skin layers and a core layer, sandwiched by the skin layers. This structure will be denoted A/B/A, wherein the A layer denotes a skin layer, corresponding to the second layer comprising mPE, above, and the B layer denotes the core layer, corresponding to the first layer described above. It will be recognized that the A layers do not need to be identical, however. (Paragraph [0056]; emphasis added).

Applicants believe that the accompanying amendment makes clear that the claimed film does not merely comprise an A/B/A structure somewhere within the film, but instead has two outer skin layers and a core layer as claimed.

Withdrawal of the rejection is requested on this basis alone.

Claims 24, 26-28, 31-43 and 47-50 have been rejected under **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)** as obvious over Ezaki et al. in view of Lue et al. and further in view of Lind et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Pub. No. 2001/0003624). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

Applicants reiterate their remarks in traverse of the application of Ezaki et al. and Lue et al. as applied to the present claims, as set forth above.

Again, the secondary reference to Lind et al. fails to cure the underlying deficiencies of the combination of Ezaki et al. and Lue et al.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is requested.

\*\*\*\*\*

Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney, if there are any issues outstanding which have not been presented to the Examiner's satisfaction. If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket # 2003B101A-US).

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank E. Reid/

Frank E. Reid  
Attorney for Applicants  
U.S. Reg. No.: 37,918

Date: April 19, 2010

ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
(281) 834-1743 (Office)  
(281) 834-2495 (facsimile)